

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the Declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 and remarks which follow. This response accompanies a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) requesting entry of the new Declaration. Its consideration is believed to be in order.

Claims 1-41 are pending. Claims 1-13, 15-22 and 26-41 stand withdrawn from consideration. Claims 14 and 23-25 are rejected.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner indicated that the after final amendment was entered and that the rejection of claims 23-25 under the first paragraph of section 112 and the rejection of claim 14 under section 103(a) based on Forray taken in view of Sakurai were withdrawn. Claim 14 was cancelled by the after final amendment.

Claims 1-13 and 15-41 are pending. Claims 1-13, 15-22 and 26-41 remain withdrawn from consideration. Claims 23-25 are rejected.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner indicated why the previous showing under 37 CFR 1.132 was not sufficient, and invited the submission of a showing where at least one of the examples E1-E3 where only Compound 1 for the bismaleimide of Herr is substituted and the other remaining components- silver, Compound 2, initiator and silane- remain constant. This comparison was undertaken and is presented in the new Declaration under 37 CFR 1.132.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Herr et al.* (US 6,265,530) in view of *Sakurai* (JP 2003-040939) and further in view of *Chan* (US 5,006,575). Applicants respectfully traverse.

The arguments previously presented in prior responses are incorporated herein by reference.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner invited an additional showing, described above, the new declaration is directed to that showing.

In the declaration, the showing is described as the one requested. The results are reported in the table. It is stated in the declaration: "As is clear from the comparison between E1 to E3 and E'1 to E'3, compared with the compositions of E'1 to E'3 in which the bismaleimide of Example C of Herr et al. is used in place of Compound 1, the corresponding compositions E1 to E3 are very excellent in any of the adhesion strengths 1 to 3. Such an effect of using bismaleimide compound (B') would not have been readily anticipated by a person skilled in the art."

It is further stated: "It has been proved by the above results that even though compound 1 (bismaleimide compound) is replaced with bismaleimide of Example C of Herr et al in Examples E1 to E3 in the specification of the subject application, unlike the composition of the subject application, the resulting compositions can not obtain excellent adhesion to surfaces to be adhered to (especially a metal surface), while having excellent warpage and reflow resistance."

Accordingly, it is submitted that a proper prima facie case has not been established for the reasons of record.

Further, should a prima facie case be deemed to have been established, the newly submitted Rule 132 declaration, which provides the requested showing, rebuts the prima facie case. The results shown in the specification are unexpected as declared in the declaration.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Favorable action at the Examiner's earliest convenience is respectfully requested.


CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Official Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal

communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

It is not believed that extensions of time are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in accompanying documents. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a), and any fees required therefor are hereby authorized to be charged to **Deposit Account No. 02-4300, Attorney Docket No. 033036.110.**

Respectfully submitted,
SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP

By: 
Thomas G. Wiseman, Reg. No. 35,046
Suite 1130
1130 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: (202) 973-2612
Facsimile: (202) 263-4317

Date: August 8, 2011